

1 MINUTES OF THE
2 September 18, 2008 Meeting of the
3 Easton Planning & Zoning Commission
4

5 Members Present: John Atwood, Chairman, and members, Tom Moore, Steve Periconi,
6 Linda Cheezum and Dan Swann.
7

8 Members Absent:
9

10 Staff Present: Tom Hamilton, Town Planner, Zach Smith, Current Planner, Lynn
11 Thomas, Long Range Planner, and Stacie Rice, Planning Secretary.
12

13 Staff Absent:
14

15 Mr. Atwood called the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission to order at
16 1:00 p.m. The first order of business was the approval of the minutes of the
17 Commission's August 21, 2008 meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Swann seconded by Mr.
18 Moore the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the August minutes.
19

20 The first item discussed was **8703 Ocean Gateway** requesting architectural
21 review of previously approved site plan. Bill Stagg, the applicant's agent, explained that
22 in January 2007 the Commission reviewed and approved a sketch site plan for a 2,584
23 square foot one story retail building. At that time the Commission did not approve the
24 architecture of the building. They have revised the architecture, and have also revised the
25 fencing and fence location. Mr. Stagg explained that two adjacent neighbors have
26 requested the fence, to help stop pollution adversely affecting their properties located in
27 the North Clifton Subdivision. They are proposing an 8 foot fence. Mr. Smith stated all
28 the staff concerns have been addressed. Upon motion of Mrs. Cheezum, seconded by Mr.
29 Swann the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the sketch site plan as presented.
30

31 The next item discussed was **Easton Village** presenting the final design of the
32 **Community Pier**. Mr. Mike Burlbaugh of Elm Street Development showed the
33 Commission a power point presentation explaining the history of the pier and where we
34 are today. He stated that Easton Village is a 250 unit residential PUD development
35 currently under construction. The project was approved by the Town Council in 2003
36 (ordinance 461) and condition 16 of the Council approval required that the *configuration,*
37 *size and number of slips for the community pier is subject to future review and approval*
38 *by the Town Planning Commission*. In Mr. Burlbaugh's presentation he explained that he
39 had obtained all of the necessary permits to construct the pier through an extensive
40 process that included review and approval by the State's Critical Area Staff, Maryland
41 Department of Natural Resources, Maryland Department of the Environment, Maryland's
42 Board of Public Works and the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers. The final design of the
43 project is the outcome of the requirements of the various reviews. Mr. Atwood stated
44 that the Commission had received numerous letters from Easton Village residents in
45 support of the pier. Upon motion of Mr. Periconi, seconded by Mr. Moore, the
46 Commission voted 5-0 to find the intent of the pier consistent with the Comprehensive
47 Plan and the Town should issue the appropriate permits.
48
49
50
51

5 The next item discussed was **325-333 South Lane** requesting PRD (Planned
6 Redevelopment) review of a three lot residential subdivision for three existing structures.
7 This property is located at the corner of South Lane and Higgins Street. Mr. Hilyard,
8 owner, explained that the Maryland Tax Assessment rolls show the three structures each
9 on their own lot and it was assumed that the property had at some point been subdivided.
10 Research has indicated otherwise and the owner would like to sell the units separately.
11 The houses have been there for years and there is no plan to enlarge or alter any unit.
12 The corner unit and the middle unit are just over 3 feet apart at the front and 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ feet at
13 the rear. The middle unit and the smaller unit to its left are ten feet apart. Mr. Hilyard is
14 looking to subdivide each structure onto its own lot. The Town Building Department has
15 pointed out that should the line be established between lot 2 and 3 with only a three foot
16 separation, the building code requires that the adjacent walls on each structure would
17 have to be fire rated and windows eliminated. Should the property line be adjusted to "0"
18 feet on one lot the other would not have to be rated. Upon motion of Mr. Moore,
19 seconded by Mr. Periconi, the Commission voted 3-2 (Cheezum, Swann opposed) to
20 approve the request and authorize the Chairman to sign the plat once all issues have been
21 addressed with the staff.
22

23 The next item on the agenda was **Calvert Terrance, LLC.** requesting review of a
24 PUD (Planned Unit Development) subdivision for expansion to Calvert Terrace. The
25 property is located on the west side of Calvert Street North of Dove Lane. The applicant
26 Scott Saunders, and Tom Moore of DMS & Associates explained they are proposing a 76
27 total dwelling units (12 single family detached and 64 townhouses). Mr. Saunders
28 explained that Calvert Terrace was platted in 1950's / 60's and this third section was
29 recorded in April 1963. All that has been constructed of this section is Lomax Street and
30 Dove Lane. Mr. Davis explained that the undeveloped portion of the previously approved
31 subdivision has 33 lots. The proposed density is 6.4 units per acre where the PUD allows
32 them to ask for up to 16 units per acre. The layout follows a natural progression with
33 single family detached next to the existing single family units progressing to traditional
34 town homes configured in a row then two clusters of smaller townhome units. Mark
35 Keeley with traffic concepts explained they propose to have both public and private
36 streets. Tuckahoe Road will be a public street and the balance of the access drive is to be
37 private. Mr. Keeley concluded that the existing and proposed streets should be adequate
38 to handle the trips generated by the 76 new units. Cindy Todd a landscape design
39 specialist explained that the Landscaping plan attached to the sketch site plan appears to
40 be adequate and complies with the town standards. The site plan indicates common open
41 space proposed at 5.06 acres where the 30% standard requires only 3.573 acres. Much of
42 the open space is in stream buffers and nontidal wetlands and is mostly wooded. There
43 are three small open space areas around the clusters of townhomes units 36 thru 76. One
44 play- ground is proposed between blocks of townhomes. The following are comments
45 form the public. Gene Butler – Was concerned with the added traffic, additional traffic
46 getting onto Goldsborough Street, the unsightliness of Norris Taylors project. Dixie
47 Caulk – Stated that any given day in the summer the traffic is backed up to Aurora Street
48 and the proposed PUD will bring an increase in traffic. Evelyn Corbin – Asked about the
49 density and concerned with the connection to Merrick Lane. Eillen Deymier – Lives on
50 Aurora Street and asked the Commission to not approve the project on the premises that
51 one day there will be connector road which will help the traffic issues.
52

1 Planning & Zoning Minutes

2 Page 3

3 September 18, 2008

4
5 Tom Moore suggested to the applicant they build 23 or 25 of the units now and come
6 back in the future to build the remainder. Mr. Saunders explained that this scenario
7 would not be feasible. Mr. Atwood made a motion to send a favorable recommendation
8 to the Town Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moore, however it was defeated
9 by a 3-2 vote. Therefore, it goes to the Town Council with a negative request.

10
11 The next item was from staff concerning **137 N. Washington Street, 204 N.**
12 **Washington Street, and 207 W. Harrison Street** (former Rugged Roses Store north to
13 Harrison's Liquors). Mr. Hamilton explained that Lehr Jackson Associates are
14 developing of a portion of the North Block. The subject block is defined as everything
15 inside the area bounded by Goldsborough Street to the south, Harrison Street to the east
16 and Washington Street to the west. Mr. Hamilton explained that the existing buildings in
17 this block, beginning with structures at the south end, are located anywhere from 0' to 3'
18 or so from the front property line. Mr. Stagg, applicant is requesting the Town Council
19 establish the front building restriction setback for this block in downtown Easton at three
20 (3) feet. Upon motion of Mr. Swann, seconded by Mr. Periconi the Commission voted
21 5-0 to approve

22
23 There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. by
24 motion of Mr. Periconi, seconded by Mr. Atwood.

25
26 Respectfully submitted,

27
28
29 Stacie S. Rice
30 Planning Secretary
31